

**UNITED STA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trad mark Offic**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/922, 240 08/27/97 SCHREIBER

S APM-007.01

HM12/0224

EXAMINER

PATENT GROUP
FOLEY HOAG & ELIOT
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON MA 02109

HAUDA, K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1632

11

DATE MAILED:

02/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Advisory Action | Application No. 08/922,240 | Applicant(s) Schreiber et al. |
| | Examiner Karen M. Hauda | Group Art Unit 1632 |

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Feb 7, 2000 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Feb 7, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

The proposed amendment(s):

- will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- will not be entered because:
 - they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
 - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
 - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

The rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph are withdrawn upon entry of the after final amendment.

Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

While applicants response reduces some of the issues, the claims are still rejected for the reasons of record. Claim 2 is still directed to hematopoietic cells, and none of the claims are limited to the enabled combination of mutated

The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1-27, 29-33, 36, 38, and 39

The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ has has not been approved by the Examiner.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Other The 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection is maintained. Applicants have failed to demonstrate a correlation between in vitro inhibition of T-cells and in vivo treatment of GvHD.


KAREN M. HAUDA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1632